



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,942	01/21/2000	Paul W. Sherer	1112-US-CIP	5139
56436	7590	03/24/2009		
3COM CORPORATION 350 CAMPUS DRIVE MARLBOROUGH, MA 01752-3064			EXAMINER STRANGE, AARON N	
			ART UNIT 2453	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/24/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/488,942

Applicant(s)

SHERER ET AL.

Examiner

AARON STRANGE

Art Unit

2453

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/5/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-22, 24 and 29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 19-21 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22, 24 and 29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/02)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The declaration filed 12/5/2008 is noted and has been entered.
2. Upon further consideration, the Examiner has determined that a double patenting rejection is applicable to some of the pending claims. The rejection is set forth below.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 22 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 4 of U.S. Patent No. 5,872,920 and claim 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,112,252 in view of AMD's Am79C830 FORMAC Plus as disclosed in "The SUPERNET 2 family for FDDI - 1991/1992 World Network Data Book"

(hereinafter AMD) (Prior art submitted by applicant in parent application 09/028,088). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the prior patents contain all limitations of claim 22 except for the final limitation "wherein said host computer employs a driver allowing for early indications and having an early lookahead size associated with a predetermined first receive threshold number of bytes".

AMD disclosed use of an early receive interrupt once a predetermined number of bytes [threshold] of data packet less than all of said data packet has been received [Apparent from page 2-32 col.1 "INTERRUPTS. The interrupt signals MINTR1 or MINTR2 ... are asserted when FORMAC Plus status changes", page 2-52 col.2 "The receive frames are loaded into the buffer memory ... for single-frame receive mode ... The RDATA timing depends upon the receive threshold value...", page 2-64 bottom of col.1 "the ST2 register contains status bit that may generate maskable interrupts on the MINTR2 pin", bottom of col.2 "Receive Frame. RSCVRM (bit10) - This bit is set, during single-frame receive-mode operation, to interrupt the NP and indicate that data is present in the buffer memory"].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to incorporate the use of an early receive interrupt, as disclosed by AMD, within Metcalfe's Ethernet communication adapter, so that a host computer system can reduce processing time by passing the received bytes up to the application layer of the host system sooner (AMD, page 2-37, col.1 "Threshold Detection" paragraph).

5. Claims 22, 24 and 29 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,412,782. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 contain every element of claims 22, 24 and 29 of the present application and claims 22, 24 and 29 are therefore not patentably distinct from the earlier patent claims and as such are unpatentable over obviousness-type double patenting.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 19-21 are allowed.
7. Claims 22, 24 and 29 are allowable over the prior art of record, but are subject to a double patenting rejection, as set forth above.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON STRANGE whose telephone number is (571)272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aaron Strange/
Examiner, Art Unit 2453